

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/524,021	02/09/2005	Yoshiji Yamada	80174(302730)	3971	
21874 EDWARDS A	7590 08/06/200 NGELL PALMER & E	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 558	74	KAPUSHOC, STEPHEN THOMAS			
BOSTON, MA	X 02205		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1634			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/06/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/524,021		YAMADA ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Stephen Kapushoc	1634		
	otopiion raspaoneo	1001		

	Stephen Kapushoc	1634			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.			
 X he reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.				
☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropriat	e extension fee		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as		
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be	Flad within two month	of the date of		
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extel Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I 	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100		
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	Od Con attached Nation of Nan Co.		DTOL 224)		
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).		
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the		
7. A pro purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .		be entered and an e	xplanation of		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a		
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.		
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:		
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
/Jehanne Sitton/ Primary Examiner	/Stephen Kapushoc/ Examiner, Art Unit 1634				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of claim 20 under 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph, as set forth on pages 2-3 of the Office Action of 02/22/2008 is withdrawn in light of the amendments to the claims, which are entered.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowence because: Applicants asset (p.4 of the Remarks of 65/22/2008) hat the amended colaim 20 recites a method for diagnosing the risk of restenosis in a Japanese man comprising the steps (i) to (iii) and requiring the analysis of three particular polymorphic positions. Applicants assert that the specification and knowledge of one of skill in the art fully enables one of skill in the art to practice the scope of the claimed invention. The argument is not found to be persuasive. The Examiner maintains that, as set forth in the rejection of the previous Office Action, the instant specification is enabling for methods requiring the detection of specific nucleotide content at the recited polymorphic positions and association of the particular content with genetic risk of restenosic (page 4 of the previous Office Action). The presently amended claims only generical recite polymorphisms at particular positions of different genes, but do not recite the required nucleotide content. As such the rejection of claim 20 under 35 USC 112 1st paragraph is maintained for the reasons of record as presented in the previous Office Action.